

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

|                      |   |                         |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| DANTE CRIDDLE,       | ) |                         |
|                      | ) |                         |
| Plaintiff,           | ) |                         |
|                      | ) |                         |
| vs.                  | ) | Case No. 1:19 CV 79 RWS |
|                      | ) |                         |
| JASON LEWIS, et al., | ) |                         |
|                      | ) |                         |
| Defendants.          | ) |                         |


**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

In his latest motion, plaintiff asks the Court to produce his documents to defendants for him because is proceeding in forma pauperis. The motion will be denied as the Court cannot respond to discovery requests for plaintiff. Plaintiff is required to provide his own written responses (handwritten is acceptable) to defendants' interrogatories and request for production of documents. Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does not require plaintiff to provide copies of responsive documents to defendants. Instead, he must merely provide the documents for inspection by defense counsel. Plaintiff should communicate with defense counsel about the inspection of any responsive documents, and defense counsel can then coordinate with the correctional institution about the inspection of these documents, if appropriate. If plaintiff has already attached responsive documents to previous filings with the Court, then he should identify those documents for defense counsel (ie., Exhibit A to a previous motion, etc.). Plaintiff will not be permitted to present any documents at trial that have not been appropriately identified in discovery, so all responsive documents must be identified and offered for inspection. Finally, plaintiff must consult the Federal and Local Rules of Civil Procedure regarding procedures that

must be followed during discovery, as this Court is not plaintiff's counsel and cannot assist or advise him in the prosecution of his case.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that pro se motion [67] is denied.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY W. SIPPEL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 4th day of February, 2020.